3 1761 07455239 9

PR
2976
H25

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2010 with funding from
University of Toronto

http://www.archive.org/details/memorandaonallsw00hall

Shakespeare Memoranda.

MEMORANDA

ON

All's Well that Ends Well,
The Two Gentlemen of Verona,
Much Ado about Nothing,

AND ON

Titus Andronicus.

BY

J. O. HALLIWELL-PHILLIPPS, F.R.S.

51444
1901

BRIGHTON:
PRINTED BY MESSRS. FLEET AND BISHOP.

1879.

PR
2976
H25

All's Well that Ends Well.

THE main incidents of the serious portion of the present comedy were originally related in the Decameron of Boccaccio, in the ninth novel of the third day, a story which was known to Shakespeare through the medium of an English translation, first published in William Painter's Palace of Pleasure, in the year 1566; reprinted in 1575. The outline of the novel is thus described in the title of the translation in the latter work,—"Giletta, a phisician's doughter of Narbon, healed the Frenche Kyng of a fistula, for reward whereof she demaunded Beltramo, counte of Rossiglione, to husbande; the counte beyng maried againste his will, for despite fled to Florence, and loved another; Giletta, his wife, by pollicie founde meanes to lye with her husbande in place of his lover, and was begotten with child of twoo sonnes, whiche knowen to her husbande, he received her againe, and afterwardes she lived in greate honor and felicitie."

This brief notice of the contents of the tale sufficiently indicates the outline of so much of the story as was adopted by the great dramatist, who has followed the preliminary circumstances with much fidelity, but has deviated considerably from the concluding incidents, which are exhibited in the play at greater length than they are presented to us in the novel, while the comic portion of the former is entirely new. In Boccaccio, the prototype of Helena, instead of being prostrated with grief at the absence of her husband, and unceasingly pursuing her love-labours, governs a province with wisdom, and gains the esteem of the people, before she takes the recovery of her husband's affections into consideration, thus involving a calmness of action inconsistent with the character as pourtrayed by Shakespeare. The supposed death of the heroine, the scenes in which her husband's mother is introduced, and the report of her murder, are also peculiar to the comedy. Shakespeare has adopted the name of Bertram from the novel, anglicizing it from *Beltram*, but this is the only appellation in his list of characters that is so derived, although Helena's father, Gerard de Narbon, is so called in both compositions. The name of Violenta seems to

have been suggested by the story of Didaco and Violenta, which occurs in the same volume of the Palace of Pleasure as that in which Giletta of Narbona is found. It is worthy of remark that Boccaccio's novel had been dramatised early in the sixteenth century by Bernard Accolti, in an Italian comedy entitled Virginia, first printed in 1513, and several times republished in the sixteenth century; but the novelist is very closely followed in this production, and there is no reason for supposing that Shakespeare was acquainted with it. Painter's translation of the original story in Boccaccio is in fact the only real source for any of the incidents of the English comedy that has yet been discovered, but it contains suggestions for nearly the whole of the main action of the serious portion of the comedy. Even the scenes in which the wars between the Florentines and the Siennois are alluded to may have been derived from the same source, for the hero of the tale is represented, after the desertion of his wife, as going into Tuscany, "where, understanding that the Florentines and Siennois were at war, he determined to take the Florentines' part, and was willingly received and honorably entertained, and made captain of

a certain number of men, continuing in their service a long time."

There are reasons for believing that All's Well that Ends Well originally appeared under another, certainly the more graceful, and perhaps the more appropriate, title of Love's Labour's Won. Meres, in his Palladis Tamia, 1598, speaking of the writings of Shakespeare, says,—"for comedy, witness his Gentlemen of Verona, his Errors, his Love Labors Lost, his Love Labors Wonne, his Midsummers Night Dreame, and his Merchant of Venice." It is evident, therefore, on unquestioned authority, that, late in the year 1598, one of the comedies of Shakespeare was called Love Labours Won, or, to judge from the analogous instance of the companion drama, a play the proper title of which was Love's Labour's Won; and unless the somewhat improbable conjecture that this is a lost play be adopted, one of the comedies not mentioned in the above list was, under some form or other, so styled at the time of its production. The comedies that answer to this condition are,—1, The Tempest, a play in which the labours by which love is won are of brief duration, and capriciously imposed merely for a temporary purpose; 2, The Merry Wives

of Windsor, a title too obvious and definite to admit of conjectural alteration, and a comedy to which the title in Meres cannot be considered with probability to apply; 3, Measure for Measure, which involves no action applicable to the new title; 4, Much Ado about Nothing; 5, As You Like It; 6, The Taming of the Shrew; 7, The Winter's Tale, which, with the three previous comedies, may fairly be dismissed from consideration as candidates for the appellation in question; and lastly, Twelfth Night, or What you Will, the double title of which sufficiently precludes the probability of a third name having been assigned to it. In this discussion, the presumed dates of the composition of these plays are not considered, none of them having been established with absolute certainty. The real questions are, whether the title of Love's Labour's Won does not indicate a drama in which the main incident involves the triumph of love over serious difficulties by indomitable perseverance, and if there is any one of the other comedies in Shakespeare not mentioned by Meres to which such a description applies so forcibly as doth that of All's Well that Ends Well. If these inquiries are answered in the affirmative, it may then be safely concluded

that Love's Labour's Won was originally the name of the present comedy, either in a separate form, or as a second title. The latter supposition is the most likely to be correct, for although Helena tells Bertram that by her steadfast labours he is "doubly won," won by two series of love-labours, there are no fewer than four distinct allusions in the play to the proverb of All's Well that Ends Well, and the last,—"all is well ended, if this suit be won," seems almost to indicate the correctness of the assumption that, in the author's original manuscript, the comedy was entitled, All's Well that Ends Well, or Love's Labour's Won. The evidence is obviously insufficient to warrant any alteration in the title as given in the first folio of 1623, but, unless it be supposed that the editors of that edition omitted a comedy which is not now known to exist, it seems almost certain that the present drama was the one alluded to by Meres under the latter title. An admission of this presumed fact necessarily implies a belief that the play was produced at least as early as in the year 1598. It is not impossible that either the players, or the editors of the first folio of 1623, altered the title of Love's Labour's Won without due authority.

There is evidence that plays were sometimes printed with new names. Thus in Cokain's Poems, 1658, is one "to my friend Mr. Thomas Randolph, on his play called the Entertainment, printed by the name of the Muses Looking-glass." It is also worthy of remark that Shakespeare's comedy at a later period, seems to have passed under the name of Monsieur Parolles, that appellation being assigned to it by King Charles I. in a manuscript note in a copy of the second folio of 1632, preserved at Windsor Castle, which formerly belonged to that unfortunate monarch. No notice of All's Well that Ends Well, under that title, has been discovered of a date previous to its entry on the books of the Stationers' Company, in November, 1623, where it is placed in the list of "soe manie of the said copies as are not formerly entred to other men."

The adoption of the date of composition, thus conjecturally assigned, does not involve any variance with allusions to contemporary incidents or fashions in the play itself, as far as the latter are at present discovered or understood. When Helena, in the first scene, calls Parolles by the epithet, Monarch, she is supposed to allude to a character also mentioned in the companion

drama of Love's Labour's Lost, who, under the title of Monarch or Monarcho, was well-known in London at the latter part of the sixteenth century, and whose boasting propensities rendered his name a fitting appellation for Parolles, which he was anxious to disclaim, though his wit failed him, and he was constrained to utter merely a monosyllabic negative. There is no doubt he felt that the implied satire was deservedly bestowed. The notice of the surplice, in the same act, is not of any utility in the consideration of the subject of date, as the controversy respecting this article of ecclesiastical costume was carried on previously to 1598, and continued at intervals for many years afterwards. Of as little consideration is the presumed allusion to a book called the Theorique and Practice of Warre, published in 1597, the passage which is conjectured to apply to this work bearing no necessary reference to any publication of the kind.

There is, however, a notice towards the close of the play which is worth some consideration, and may possibly be thought of sufficient moment to deserve the title of an evidence of probability in the question as to the chronology or period of its composition. When Lafeu

styles Parolles "good Tom Drum," he refers of course to the incident of the drum which that character professed to be so anxious to recover, but the nickname itself is not necessarily original, and when it is considered that the story of Tom Drum takes a prominent position in one of the popular novels of the day, in which he is introduced as a notorious liar and braggart, the probabilities are that Shakespeare, when he places the name as applied to Parolles in the mouth of Lafeu, was not merely thinking of the old proverbial expression of Tom Drum's or Jack Drum's Entertainment, but that he introduced it as a name well known to the audience, and most appropriate in its application to the detected character of Parolles. The story of Tom Drum was familiar to the English public through the medium of Deloney's Second Part of the Gentle Craft, a most merry and pleasant History not altogether unprofitable nor any way hurtfull, very fit to passe away the tediousnes of the long winter evenings, 4to. London, Printed for Edward White, and are to be sold at his shop neere the little North doore of S. Paules at the signe of the Gun, 1598. This was probably the first edition, printed late in 1597 or very early in 1598, the work being entered

on the books of the Stationers' Company in October, 1597. In the sixth chapter of this second part, which relates "how Harry Nevell and Tom Drum came to serve Peachey of Fleete-streete," the author thus commences the history of the latter personage,—"among manie other that was desirous of his service, there was one called Tom Drum, that had a great minde to be his man, a very odde fellow, and one that was sore infected with the sinne of cogging; this boasting companion, sitting on a time sadlie at worke in his master's shoppe at Petworth," &c. Deloney then proceeds to relate how he left this situation, and the merry manner in which he was accompanied by his fellow countrymen a mile out of the town. As Tom Drum proceeded on his way, in the best possible spirits, he encounters a young gentleman who had deserted his parents, and having expended the whole of his money, was travelling to London with a heavy heart, in the expectation that he might obtain the means of existence in the metropolis. Our hero, at the first view of the youth, shows himself, like Parolles, an unquestionable coward, mistaking him for a highwayman,—"at whose sodaine sight Tom Drum started like one that had spide an adder,

and seeing him provided with a good sword and buckler, supposed he had been one that waited for a fat purse," but he soon discovered he was under an erroneous impression, and the new acquaintance, whose name was Harry, speedily enters into conversation, and ultimately into friendship, with the journeyman shoemaker. Shortly before they arrive at Guildford, Tom Drum is anointed a gentleman by the silly process of permitting his face to be smeared with the blood from one of Harry's fingers, which was duly wounded for the occasion, while they exchange clothes, and Tom, says the story, "swaggard with his sword and buckler." Tom Drum now commences his exaggerations and falsehoods. "I durst lay a good wager," quoth he, "I have made more shooes in one day then all the jorneymen heere have done in a month; with that, one of the jorneymen began to chafe, saying, how many paire of shooes hast thou made in a day? I made, quoth Tom, when the daies were at longest, eight score paire of shooes in one day! O monstrous detestable lie, quoth they, and thereupon one ran into the chimney and cryed, come again, Clement, come againe. Who call'st thou, quoth Tom? I call Clement Carrie-lye that runnes poste betwixt the Turke

and the devill, that he may take his full loading ere hee goe, for the best jorneyman that ever I knew never made above ten paire in a day in his life, and I will laie my whole yeeres wages with thee, that thou canst not make twentie paire in a day as they ought to be; I should bee ashamed but to doe as much as another, and I never saw him yet that could out-work me, yet dare not I take upon me to make a dosen paire of shoes in a day; but 'tis an old saying, they brag most that can doe least. Why, thou puple, quoth Tom, thou house-dove, thou cricket that never crept further then the chimney-corner, tel me what countries hast thou travelled? Far enough, quoth he, to proove as good a workeman as thou art. I deny that, quoth Tom, for I have beene where I have seene men headed like dogs, and women of the same shape, where, if thou hadst offer'd them a kisse, they would have beene ready to have snapt off thy nose; othersome I have seene that one of their legs hath beene as good as a penthouse to cover their whole bodies, and yet I have made them shooes to serve their feete, which I am sure thou couldst never doe; nay, if thou wilt goe with me, if thou seest me not make an hundred paire of shooes from sunne-

rising to sun-setting, count me worse then a stinking mackrell." He follows this up with other exaggerations, advising his auditors to "take heede how you contrary a travellor, for therein you shall but bewray your owne ignorance, and make yourselves mocking stockes to men of knowledge. And travellors, quoth they, uncontroled, have liberty to utter what lyes they list." The next chapter yields nothing to the purpose of the argument on behalf of which these extracts are adduced, but the following one, which treats "of Tom Drum's vants, and his rare entertainment at Mistres Farmer's house, the faire widow of Fleete-streete," is exceedingly curious, and bears a kind of analogy to the incident of Parolles and the drum, inasmuch as it is also founded on the inability of a braggart to accomplish the object he had voluntarily and absurdly boasted was capable of easy execution. Tom Drum is, indeed, like Parolles, "a notorious liar, a great way fool, solely a coward;" he made "tolerable vent of his travel;" and his discomfiture is equally significant with that of Bertram's companion. Without then imagining that Shakespeare required even a faintly delineated prototype for the character of Parolles, or that

anything of the kind in Deloney's novel is to be considered in the light of having furnished a single suggestion to the mind of the great dramatist, it does not appear improbable that the epithet of the personage in the old novel was introduced into the comedy, because it was an appellation for an outwitted boaster, one that would be readily appreciated by the readers of the light literature of Shakespeare's time, a class to whom the contemporary dramatists naturally in some measure addressed themselves.

The title of the play, as transmitted to us by the editors of the folio edition, is an English proverbial saying of great antiquity. It was used, in a slightly varied form, during the celebrated rebellion of Jack Straw, by one of the insurgents in a speech recorded in the chronicle of Henry de Knyghton,—"Jak Carter prayeth yow alle that ye make a gode ende of that ye have begunne, and doth wele aye better and better, for atte the evyn men herethe the day, for if the ende be wele, thanne is al wele," MS. Cotton. Claud. E. iii. fol. 267, v°. "All is well that endeth well" was one of the mottos in the Lottery of 1567, drawn in 1568-9, a prize drawn by one Thomas Lawley de Chaddesley Marches,

Wales. So, in Fulwell's Ars Adulandi, 1579, to this passage in the text, "Wherefore, gentle Maister Philodoxus, I bid you adew with this motion or caveat; Respice Finem," the marginal note says, "All is Well that endes Well;" and in the Remedie of Love, 1600,—"you take the old proverb with a right application for my just excuse, All is Well that ends well, and so end I." Again, in Davies' Scourge of Folly, 1611,—"All's well that ends wel: Then it is well—Peter was hang'd, that nere praid till he fell;" and in the proverbs in Camden's Remaines, ed. 1629, p. 261; and in MS. Bodl. 30. "*Exitus acta probat*, all is well that ends well, Withals' Dictionary, ed. 1634, p. 556. It clearly appears from these, and from other examples that might be adduced, that the proverbial title of the play was not original, but that it was in common use both before and after the time of Shakespeare.

No record of any early performance of All's Well that Ends Well has yet been discovered, and it does not appear to have been revived in the seventeenth century after the accession of Charles II., nor, indeed, until October, 1741, when it was produced at Drury-lane theatre, Mrs. Woffington taking the part of Helena,

and Theophilus Cibber that of Parolles. It was again revived, under the superintendence of Garrick, in 1757, when Mrs. Prichard acted the Countess ; Miss Macklin, Helen ; Mrs. Davies, Diana ; Woodward, Parolles ; Berry, Lafeu ; and Davies, the King. In the year 1785, it was altered by Frederic Pilon, reduced to three acts, and performed at the Haymarket theatre, but this version was not printed. The alteration in use at the theatres during the last sixty years is that by Kemble, in which the offensive peculiarities of the story are to a great extent concealed, and the principal condition in Bertram's letter entirely omitted. These sacrifices to the extreme refinement of the present day so essentially weaken the action of the comedy, and impair the necessity for so much of the intensity of character evidently intended by the author, it is scarcely a matter of surprise that the performance of the drama, in this vitiated form, should not have met, at any recent period, with the success that it probably commanded on the Shaksperian stage.

The comedy of All's Well that Ends Well refers, in its chief action, to an incident very frequently introduced in the ancient romance literature, the conquest achieved by a passionate

and resistless affection over the objections created by disparity of station, obstacles that were nearly insurmountable in a feudal age. To enable us to consider the merits of this play dispassionately, and with an impartial judgment, the difficulties thus presented must be considered in distinct reference to their nature as they were regarded in the middle ages, and must not be weighed by a modern standard of comparison. Bertram, a proud noble, unexpectedly constrained by an irresistible authority, without any preparation, to marry a person of greatly inferior rank, one whom, in his pride of place, he had regarded as scarcely exalted in position above that of a menial servant in his household, waits not to reflect whether her qualities will compensate for the disparity of station, but, regardless of the king's promises, burning with rage and mortification at the unprecedented dictation of his sovereign, seeks to heal his wounded pride by immediate change of scene and action. Bertram is the very personification of impatience and pride of birth. That, in the unsettled state of mind in which he is when at Florence, becoming the victim of passion, he should seek to overrule the accidents which had rendered its lawful

gratification impossible, is a circumstance which should not induce an entire deprivation of sympathy; it is true to the natural impatience of his character, and the impetuosity with which he followed the suggestions of his own will, both stimulated to excess by the arbitrary infliction of what he considered an injustice, so that the poet would have been justified in its introduction, even were it not necessary to the development of the plot. Bertram's unscrupulous conduct, as pourtrayed in the later scenes, arises less from innate depravity than from the perplexing situation in which he is placed; and all is forgiven when, overwhelmed by the intensity of Helena's love, which had overcome difficulties he had vainly considered were insurmountable, he yields himself a willing captive to her romantic affection.

The above observations on All's Well that Ends Well were written by me in the year 1857, and out of a mass of subsequent notes I do not find any worthy of preservation.

The Two Gentlemen of Verona.

THE earliest notice of this drama which has yet been discovered is that in the list of Shakespeare's plays given by Meres in his Palladis Tamia, 1598, where it is mentioned as the Gentlemen of Verona. It is not impossible that this latter title was the original designation of the comedy, one by which it was generally known in the profession, and at a later period, Kirkman, who was intimately connected with the stage, inserts it in his list of plays, which first appeared in 1661, as the Gentleman of Verona. As a rule it is unsafe to pronounce a judgment on the period of the composition of any of Shakespeare's dramas from internal evidence, but the general opinion that this play is one of the author's earliest complete dramatic efforts may be followed without much risk of error. Admitting its lyrical beauty, its pathos, its humour and its infinite superiority to the dramas of contemporary writers, there is nevertheless a crudity in parts of the action, one at

least being especially unskilful and abrupt, which the more lengthened experience of such a writer could hardly have sanctioned. A few of its incidents occur in the tale of Felix and Felismena, which is introduced in the romance of Diana written in Spanish by George of Montemayor about the middle of the sixteenth century. The story in that romance, Felix corresponding to Proteus and Felismena to Julia, may thus be briefly narrated. A youth named Don Felix falls rapturously in love with Felismena, a young lady who is disposed to reciprocate his affection but is unwilling to acknowledge her inclination. Her maid Rosina, whom he has induced to be the bearer of a letter to her, is at first angrily repulsed ; but on a subsequent occasion, she purposely, but as if by accident, drops the missive in the sight of Felismena, who invents an excuse for its perusal. A correspondence then followed which resulted in the complete acknowledgment of the lady's affection. As, however, the course of true love never did run smooth, the father of Don Felix, as might be anticipated, gains intelligence through some officious person of their passion for each other, and, disapproving of the attachment, at once orders him to a

foreign court upon the plea that enforced idleness at home was prejudical to the formation of his character. Felix is upon this decree so overcome with grief that he leaves the object of his affections without acquainting her with his dismissal. Felismena's sorrow at his departure is increased by the jealous apprehension of the possibility of rivals when he was beyond the reach of her personal influence, and as a continued absence from her lover was unendurable, she dons male attire and travels to the same court. Upon her arrival at the town where Felix was sojourning, she takes lodgings in an unfrequented street, and by the invitation of her host experiences the trial of hearing the voice of her lover serenading another mistress. Her next step was soon decided upon. Assuming the name of Valerius, she takes the earliest opportunity of visiting the court, where she ascertained from Fabius, the page of the faithless swain, that Don Felix is enamoured with a lady of the name of Celia, who is described as inferior in beauty to Felismena. It chances that Felix is then in want of another page, and Valerius, secure in her masculine disguise, is speedily engaged. While in this service, she is compelled not only to listen to the outpourings

of the love of the perjured Felix for the obdurate Celia, but to become his advocate and the bearer of his love-letters and "tokens." Celia had determined to reject the hand of any one who had deserted another lover in her favour, but she encourages the correspondence and the expectations of her lover for the sake of obtaining interviews with Valerius, with whom she had become desperately enamoured at their first interview. Felismena continues loyally to urge the suit of her master; Celia expires of grief when she discovers that her affection for the page is wholly unrequited, and Don Felix, at the news of her death, leaves the city in an agony of despair. He is pursued by Felismena, who, after many months of fruitless search, finally discovers him in one whom she is the means, through her skilful archery, of saving from destruction in a combat in which he was engaged single-handed against three other knights. Reconciliation and marriage are the natural results of this romantic episode.

Montemayor's story, parts of which are graphically written, was in a dramatic form in English at least as early as the year 1585, when it was acted before Queen Elizabeth by her Majesty's Players,—"the history of Felix and

Philiomena shewed and enacted before her highnes by her Majesties servauntes on the sondaie next after newyeares daie at night at Grenewiche, whereon was ymploied one battlement and a house of canvas," Revels' Accounts, 1584-5. In the primitive kind of scenery which illustrated the performances of dramas acted before the Queen, a battlement was the conventional representation of any royal or courtly residence. There are a sufficient number of incidents and minute particulars common to the tale above analysed and to Shakespeare's comedy to show that the plot of the latter was partially derived either from Montemayor or from some other work, possibly the old English play just named, in which use had been made of the tale of Felismena; the latter supposition appearing much more likely to be correct than the notion that the great dramatist had perused the Spanish romance previously to the composition of the Two Gentlemen of Verona. There is, indeed, an allusion in the latter which seems to indicate the probability that Shakespeare did not take his story immediately from the Diana, but from some novel or play in which there were correct references to the topography of Milan. Although the poet's instinctive

genius enabled him to avoid a serious continuity of anachronism, it is evident from numerous examples that he was indifferent to minute accuracy in trivial matters of detail; so that when, as in this comedy, there is found a mention of St. Gregory's Well at Milan, and it is seen from Braun's Civitates Orbis Terrarum, 1582, where there is an engraving of that holy well, that it was a veritable object in that city, it may fairly be concluded that the notice in the play owes its introduction to a predecessor. Braun's work is one extremely unlikely to have been even seen, much more consulted, by Shakespeare, while the notion of the poet having visited and been well acquainted with Italy is unsupported by evidence or probability. Speed's welcome of Launce to Padua, a city which has no connexion with the plot of the comedy, may perhaps be considered an error originating in some allusion or incident in the older story, which perhaps included something analogous to the action of Valentine and Silvia in combination with that of Proteus and Julia. The drama of Felix and Philiomena is lost. The Diana was not issued in English until after November 28th, 1598, the date of the dedication to Yong's translation. Shakespeare there-

fore had obviously written the Two Gentlemen of Verona before he could have seen this publication, and no other early English translation which includes the story of Felix and Felismena is known to exist either in print or manuscript. Yong, however, asserts that his version had been completed in manuscript more than sixteen years, so it is just possible, in that age of transcript reading, that the great dramatist had perused it when in that form; more probable that the author of the play of Felix and Philiomena had thence derived the materials of his plot.

According to Tieck, there was an old English play, a German abridgment or mutilated translation of which was acted by English players in Germany about the year 1600, whence some of the materials for the story of the Two Gentlemen of Verona might have been derived. The foreign version alluded to, in which the characters are very coarsely delineated, was first printed in the Englische Comedien vnd Tragedien, 1620, under the title of Tragædia von Julio vnd Hyppolita, but the opinion of some critics that there is a strong resemblance between the plots of the two dramas, the German one and Shakespeare's, seems on examination

to be untenable. The clown in the German play is, like Speed, extremely eager after his perquisites ; and there is an incident of the tearing of a letter, but it is not in the slightest degree analogous to that in Shakespeare. The story of the play may be briefly stated as follows. Romulus, a Roman, betrothed to Hyppolita, leaves his beloved to the care of his brother Julius whilst he travels to Rome to obtain the consent of his parents to his marriage. Julius, who is secretly in love with Hyppolita, betrays his trust, intercepting the letters of Romulus and substituting others in their place, the latter being of a nature to infuriate Hyppolita and the Prince, her father. The lady, distracted by the conduct of which she presumes Romulus to have been guilty, eventually determines to accept her father's advice and marry Julius ; while Romulus, on his return, accidentally discovering the fragments of the spurious letter that Hyppolita, when she received, had torn in pieces, of course ascertains the treachery by which his hopes had been defeated. But the discovery was made too late, Julius and his fair bride being then returning from the Church after their marriage unconscious of the fate that awaited them, Romulus joins in the wedding dance in disguise, stabs

Julius and upbraids Hyppolita with perfidy. The latter kills herself in despair and Romulus follows her example, the Prince, overwhelmed by so great a calamity, retiring from the world. It will readily be seen that there is, in all this, nothing which may not have been invented or derived from sources that have no relation to Shakespeare's comedy; and the same observation applies to an incident in Sydney's Arcadia which has been thought to have suggested the scenes in which Valentine is induced to join the outlaws.

Athough a portion of the following lines in Tis Merrie when Gossips Meete, 1602, was proverbial, the form of the language would appear to show that Rowlands had the present comedy in his recollection,—

> The golden sentence proves blacke-bearded men
> Are precious pearles in beauteous womens eies.

INTRODUCTION.—A.D. 1855.

The serious portion of the plot of Much Ado about Nothing is derived from one of Bandello's novels, first published in the year 1554, which was probably known to Shakespeare in the French translation of Belleforest. This tale, observes Dunlop, appears to have been suggested by a story in the Orlando Furioso, book the fifth. In this narrative, to quote the analysis of the writer just named, "the duke of Albany is enamoured of Gineura, daughter of the King of Scotland. The princess, however, being prepossessed in favour of an Italian lover, the duke has recourse to stratagem to free himself from this dangerous rival. He persuades the waiting-maid of Gineura to disguise herself for one night in the attire of her mistress, and in this garb to throw down a ladder from the window, by which he might ascend into the chamber of Gineura. The duke had previously so arranged matters, that the Italian was a witness to this scene, so painful to a lover. Gineura was condemned to death for the imaginary transgression, and was

only saved by the opportune arrival of the paladin Rinaldo, who declares himself the champion of the accused princess." In the frontispiece prefixed to this portion of Ariosto's work in Harington's translation, fol. Lond. 1591, p. 31, the incident of the ascent of the ladder, which constitutes the main similarity between the stories of the poem and the comedy, is conspicuously pourtrayed; but, if Shakespeare were acquainted with Ariosto's tale he may have derived his knowledge of it from an earlier source, a metrical translation of it having appeared as early as 1565—"The Historie of Ariodanto and Jeneura, daughter to the King of Scottes, in English verse by Peter Beverley, Imprinted at London by Thomas East for Fraunces Coldocke," no date, but entered on the books of the Stationers' Company in 1565-6, and according to Warton, reprinted in the year 1600. Unless Harington has mistaken the translator's name, there was another early version of the same tale, for in a note to the fifth book, he says,—"Some others affirme that this very matter, though set downe here by other names, happened in Ferrara to a kinse-woman of the Dukes, which is here figured under the name of Geneura, and that

indeede such a practise was used against her by a great lord, and discovered by a damsel, as is here set down : howsoever it was, sure the tale is a pretie comicall matter, and hath bin written in English verse some few years past, learnedly and with good grace, though in verse of another kind, by M. George Turbervil ;" but as no copy or even notice of such a translation has yet been discovered, the probability is that Harington's memory has deceived him. It is a very curious circumstance that Ariosto's tale was dramatized in English at an early period, the following entry occurring in the Revels' Accounts, in the book relating to the period, 1581-2 to 1582-3, ed. Cunningham, p. 177,— "A Historie of Ariodante and Geneuora shewed before her Majestie on Shrovetuesdaie at night, enacted by Mr. Mulcasters children : for which was newe prepared and imployed one citty, one battlement of canvas, vij. ells of sarcenet, and ij. dozen of gloves." Thus it would seem that the serious incidents of Much Ado about Nothing may have been long familiar to Shakespeare, as well-known subjects for dramatic representation. They were also partially introduced, but with ineffable dulness, into Spenser's Faerie Queene, b. ii. c. 4.

There can be little doubt but that Shakespeare had seen the story related by Ariosto in some form, for the incident of Don John's friend persuading the maid-servant to personate her mistress at the window is not introduced into the novel of Bandello under similar circumstances. The latter is thus analyzed by Dunlop,—"Lionato, a gentleman of Messina, had a daughter named Fenicia, who was betrothed to Timbreo de Cardona, a young man of the same city. Girondo, a disappointed lover of the young lady, having resolved to prevent the marriage, sends a confidant to Timbreo to warn him of the disloyalty of his mistress, and offers that night to show him a stranger scaling her chamber window. Timbreo accepts the invitation, and in consequence sees the hired servant of Girondo, in the dress of a gentleman, ascend a ladder, and enter the house of Lionato. Stung with rage and jealousy, he next morning accuses his innocent mistress to her father, and rejects his alliance. Fenicia, on hearing this intelligence, sinks down in a swoon. This is followed by a dangerous illness, which gives her father an opportunity of preventing reports injurious to her fame, by pretending she is dead. She is accordingly sent

to the country, and her funeral rites are celebrated in Messina. Girondo, struck with remorse at having occasioned her death, now confesses his villainy to Timbreo, after which they proceed together to make the requisite apologies to her family. The sole penance which the father imposes on Timbreo is, that he should espouse a lady of his selection, and that he should not demand to see her previous to the performance of the bridal ceremony. At the nuptial festival, Timbreo, instead of the new bride he awaited, is presented with the innocent and much-injured Fenicia." The striking similarity of this story to the main incidents of the present comedy, and the coincidence in the name of the injured lady's father will be readily perceived. It is, however, difficult to account for the deviations made by Shakespeare, without entertaining the supposition that he was immediately indebted, neither to Bandello or Belleforest, but to some English version of the tale, in which the motive for the inexcusable stratagem perpetrated upon the heroine was differently related. Such a motive might have been in the poet's mind, and unconsciously assumed by him in the construction of his plot; for it must be admitted that no

reasonable cause is exhibited, in the play itself, to account for Don John's intense hatred of Claudio. On the other hand, it is possible that Shakespeare intended to pourtray, in Don John, one of those wretched characters to whom the success of another is a sufficient incentive to inextinguishable hatred and malice.

The principal incident in the Italian novel is traced by Skottowe to a period as early as the date of the Spanish romance, Tirante the White, composed in the dialect of Catalonia about the year 1400 ; and, according to Simrock, the ninth novel in the Introduction to Cinthio's Hecatommithi also represents a deception similar to that which was practised upon Fenicia, but it is there contrived by a servant-maid, who has fallen in love with her master, against her mistress. This particular incident is probably likewise to be met with in other sources, and is not in itself of great importance in the consideration of the inquiry as to the materials directly employed by the great dramatist. As far as our researches have yet extended, the probabilities are in favour of Shakespeare having either been indebted to Bandello, through the medium of Belleforest, or to some early English translation of the Italian novel, which may have been published

in the sixteenth century, although no copy or fragment of such a work has yet been discovered. It is also to be presumed, from a circumstance previously mentioned, that the poet was acquainted with the story of Ariosto, in its original or translated form, or possibly in the ancient English drama of Ariodante and Geneuora.

The story of Bandello was also employed by the German dramatist Ayrer, in the construction of the comedy of Phænicia, published in 1618; or, perhaps, to speak more correctly, Ayrer's play is founded upon the incidents of the Italian novel. Tieck supposes that the German play is merely a version of an earlier English drama, the same which was used by Shakespeare in the composition of Much Ado about Nothing; and his conjecture is supported by the following entry in the accounts of the Revels at Court in 1574;—"the expences and charges wheare my L. of Leicesters men showed theier matter of Panecia, x.s,"—the "matter of Panecia" being, in all probability, the play of Phænicia, one which may have continued to maintain its position as an acting drama during Shakespeare's early career. "In the German version," observes Mr. Thoms, "we find Timbreo not only

witnesses the ascent of Gerwalt to Phænicia's chamber; but, like Shakespeare's Claudio, he overhears an amorous conversation between Gerwalt, and Jahn, the clown of the piece, and the servant of Gerando disguised as Phænicia,—and this fact alone furnishes a strong presumption that Shakespeare was indebted not to Bandello, but to some earlier dramatist, for the plot of this comedy. A careful perusal of the old German play has indeed satisfied my mind that it is derived from an earlier English composition, that probably which is alluded to in the entry above given. Ayrer's comedy, however, is not in itself very illustrative of Shakespeare's play, and it no doubt differed most materially from its English prototype.

The quarto edition of 1600, printed by Valentine Simmes, is the chief and best authority for the text of this play. That it was reprinted from that edition in the folio of 1623, clearly appears from the occurrence of peculiarities in each that could not possibly have appeared accidentally in both places; but the folio edition has a singular reading, not found in the quarto, in which "Jack Wilson" is mentioned, which leads to the supposition that the reprint of the former was taken from a playhouse copy of the printed edition of 1600,

an exemplar of it, with a few manuscript directions and notes, having probably taken the place of the author's holograph drama." It seems impossible, on any other grounds, to account for all the curious differences, as well as for the important coincidences, which are to be traced between the two copies; and the modern text may be safely formed from a collation of these early editions, the weight of authority evidently being in favour of the quarto. The latter is thus entered in the Books of the Stationers' Company, — "23 Augusti, 1600; Andrewe Wise, William Aspley, —Twoo bookes, the one called Muche Adoo about Nothinge: thother the second parte of the History of Kinge Henry the iiij.th with the Humors of Sir John Fallstaff, wrytten by Mr. Shakespere, xij.*d.*" It appears also amongst some books "to be staied" in an entry dated August 4th, which is believed to refer to the same year 1600, there described as "the Commedie of Much Adoo about Nothinge, a book," which, with the others there named, was probably attempted to be pirated by other booksellers.

It appears, from the title-page of the quarto edition, that Much Ado about Nothing had

been performed by the Lord Chamberlain's company either in or before the year 1600, or perhaps at continuous periods from a year previously; but no very early notice of the peformance of the comedy has yet been discovered. In fact, the only extrinsic mention of it as an acting play, during the author's lifetime, occurs in the MS. accounts of Lord Harrington, Treasurer of the Chamber to James I., the originals of which are preserved in the Bodleian Library; in which it is stated that Much Ado about Nothing was one of the dramas performed by John Heminges, and the rest of the King's Company, before Prince Charles, the Lady Elizabeth, and the Prince Palatine Elector, in the beginning of the year 1613. A subsequent entry in the same volume of accounts is still more curious, mention being there made of a play entitled Benedick and Beatrice, for so the scribe's orthography may fairly be interpreted; and a difficult question arises for consideration, whether this title be that of another and possibly an older play on the same subject, or merely a second title to Much Ado about Nothing, the fact of the play being mentioned under its accepted name in the same accounts, under the same date, leading us in

some degree to the former conclusion. The entry occurs in the following terms:—"Item, paid to the said John Hemings, xx. die Maii, 1613, for presenting six severall playes, viz., one play called A bad Beginning makes a good Ending; one other called, the Captain; one, the Alchemist; one other, Cardano; one other, Hotspur; one other, Benedicte and Bettris; all played in the tyme of this accompte." Leonard Digges, in his commendatory verses on Shakespeare, speaks of Benedick and Beatrice as the prominent characters by which the play was then known, and who were doubtlessly exceedingly popular with the audience,—

> — let but Beatrice
> And Benedicke be seene, loe! in a trice
> The cockpit, galleries, boxes, all are full.

And there is a curious testimony to the fact of their being familiar to the mind of the public, in Burton's Anatomy of Melancholy, ed. 1624,—"many times those which at the first sight cannot fancy or affect each other, but are harsh and ready to disagree, offended with each other's carriage, like Benedict and Betteris in the comedy, and in whom they finde many faults, by this living together in a house, conference,

kissing, colling, and such like allurements, begin at last to dote insensibly one upon another." Were it not, therefore, for the two entries in Lord Harrington's accounts, the conclusion in favour of the second notice referring to the present comedy would scarcely be questioned; and, notwithstanding the difficulty created by those entries, it would probably be rash to decide otherwise without the assistance of further evidence on the subject. There can be no doubt but that the adventures of Benedick and Beatrice, and the ludicrous representation of the process of their conversion to mutual affection, attract the principal attention both of the reader and the audience, and that the impression made even by the inimitable blundering of the constables, as well as by the more serious scenes, is secondary.

There is no division into acts or scenes in the quarto edition of Much Ado about Nothing, and, in the folios, the play is divided into acts but not into scenes. Gildon, in his Remarks, 1710, p. 306, somewhat quaintly observes,— "the scenes of this play are something obscure, for you can scarce tell where the place is in the first two acts, tho' the scenes in them seem pretty entire and unbroken; but those are things

we ought not to look much for in Shakespear." The arrangement of the first folio in respect to the acts is that which is still generally adopted, and was, in all probability, the same that was in vogue in the author's own time. It has, however, been proposed to alter it on the ground that while time is supposed to elapse between the first and second scenes of the first act, the action is continuous from the third to the fourth act; an inconsistency which would be obviated by commencing the second act with the second scene of the first act, the third act with the third scene of the second act, and the fourth act with the fourth scene of the third act, the fifth act remaining as it is now printed. The principle here implied, that pauses in time are invariably to occur between acts, and never between scenes, is somewhat too restrictive, and cannot safely be accepted as necessary to the legitimate construction of a Shaksperian drama.

MEMORANDA.—1879.

The preceding observations on Much Ado About Nothing were written by me in the year 1855, and I am sorry to find that there is nothing of very much value or importance amongst my papers of a later date. The following memoranda, however, may be worth preservation.

The Old Tale.—An unpublished letter written by Blakeway gives an interesting account of the source whence he derived the traditional story printed in the variorum edition and in several other works. This letter, which is dated from Shrewsbury, December the 29th, 1807, has no superscription to indicate to whom it was addressed. It commences as follows,—"Your letter found me at Kinlet in the very act of removing into winter quarters here, the bustle attending which has prevented me from answering it till now. I am glad my old story amused you, and I dare say what you mention is very true, that it has received several modern sophistications in the course of its traditional descent, each narratrix accommodating it to the

manners of her age. You are the best judge whether it is likely to have been of Italian origin, but you are perfectly right in your remark that the relater has inserted familiar names of the county, for the family of Fox, not the least akin, I believe, to the deceased orator of that name, was formerly a very opulent and widely extended one in Shropshire. In answer to your enquiry when my great aunt, from whom I had the story, died, I have the pleasure to inform you that that truly venerable old lady is still living, and at the advanced age of 92, for she was baptized, as appears by a copy of the register now before me, July 26th, 1715, in the full enjoyment of her mental faculties. From the history of our family I think it likely that she may have received the tale from persons born in Charles the Second's time, but when I see her next I will ask her if she can recollect."

The Hundred Merry Tales.—This was the title of a very popular jest-book of the sixteenth century, frequently reprinted, but copies of two editions only are now known to be in existence. The title of one of these consists simply of the words,—A C. Mery Talys,—the colophon being as follows,—" Here endeth the booke of a c. mery talys, Imprinted at London at the sygne

of the Meremayde at Powlys gate nexte to Chepesyde," with Rastell's device on the last leaf. A copy at Gottingen, recently discovered, has the following colophon,—"Thus endeth the booke of a C. mery talys, Emprynted at London at the synge of the Merymayd at Powlys gate next to chepe syde, the yere of our Lorde M. v. C. xxvj,the xxij. of November,—Johannes Rastell." The earliest separate notice of the work occurs in the Registers of the Stationers' Company, 1557-8, when "a boke called an hundreth mery tayles" is mentioned as being licensed to John Wally or Whalley. In January, 1581-2, it was licensed to John Charlwood, and it had no doubt been printed in the interval between these dates. James Roberts was the next publisher, Charlwood having transferred the book to him on May 31st, 1594, and Roberts assigned it to W. Jaggard in 1615, the representative of the last-named publisher transferring the copyright to Thomas and Richard Cotes in 1627. The Hundred Merry Tales are mentioned by Laneham in the list of books in Captain Cox's library given in his Letter from Kenilworth printed about the year 1575, and also in the following works,—Epistle prefixed to Hanmer's Eusebius, 1585; the English Courtier and the Cuntrey

Gentleman, 1586; Pierces Supererogation, 1593; Harrington's Apology, 1596; the Priests of Peblis, 1603; Wily Beguiled, 1606; Taylor's Workes, 1630; and in a list of popular books cried for sale by a ballad-man in the London Chaunticleres, a comedy, 1659. "I could tell you more, as he hath done, out of that most learned author, *the Book of Merry Tales*, from whence his best jests are derived: but that, as the old manciple of Brazen-noze College in Oxford was wont to say, There are more fools to meet with."—*Ulysses upon Ajax*, 1596.

I could fill a whole volume, and call it the second part of the *hundred mery tales*, onely with such ridiculous stuffe as this of the Justice; but *Dii meliora*; I have better matters to set my wits about: neither shall you wring out of my pen (though you lay it on the racke) the villainies of that damnd keeper, who killd all she kept.—*Decker's Wonderfull Yeare*, 1603.

Bevis of Hampton he had read, and Guy of Warwick stout;
Huon of Bordeaux, though so long, yet he had read him out.
The Hundred Tales and Scoggin's Jests, and Arthur of the Round Table;
The twelve Wise Men of Gotham too, and ballads innumerable.

The Trimming of Tom Nash, poem in MS. Sloane 1489.

The following very curious notice of this work having been a favourite one with Queen Elizabeth, occurs in a letter dated 1603 preserved in the State Paper Office :—"About ten dayes synce dyed the Countess of Notingham. The Queene loved the Countess very much, and hath seemed to take her death very heavelye, remayning ever synce in a deepe melancholye with conceipte of her own death, and complayneth of many infirmyties sodainlye to have overtaken her, as impostum, megrin in her head, aches in her bones, and continuall cold in her legges, besides notable decay in judgement and memory, insomuch as she cannot attend to any discources of government and state, *but delighteth to heare some of the* 100 *merry tales, and such like, and to such is very attentive* ; at other tymes very impatient and testye, so as none of the Counsayle, but the secretary, dare come in her presence," See other notices in the variorum edition of Shakespeare, ed. 1821, vii. 165-6.

Two aspicious persons.—Middleton apparently had one of Dogberry's speeches in his recollection when, in his Mad World my Masters, 1608, he makes another constable say,—"May it please your worship, sir, here are a company of auspicious fellowes."

Dogberry and Verges.—According to Steevens, these names are adopted from the *dog-berry*, the female cornel, and *verjuice*, Verges being a corruption. I find, however, that Dogberry occurs as a surname as early as the time of Richard the Second in a charter preserved in the British Museum, Harl. 76 c. 13, and in MS. Ashmol. 38 is a couplet, "uppon old Father Varges, a misserable usurer." An allusion in Shirley's Constant Maid, 1640, "my most exquisite Varges," seems to aim at Shakespeare's officer, but the particular application of the name in that place is not very apparent, "Vergys, *acetum*," MS. Arundel 249, fol. 89. "The brim of a dish, platter or other vessell; the verges;" Nomenclator, 1585. The name Borachio is obviously derived from the Spanish wine-bottle so called. "Another way it is very craftily done by a Spanish *borachio*, that is, a leather bottle as thin and lithe as a glove, the neck whereof is about a foot long, with a screw at the top instead of a stopple," Ady's Candle in the Dark, 1656.

I cannot see how sleeping, &c.—Compare the following curious passage in Parkes's Curtaine-Drawer of the World, 1612,—"not many nights since, when we had walked all our stations from

the first bounds of our wardes to the last step it contained, and had not met with any incounter worthy the examination or the Counter, from whence wee might extract or derive our customary fees, till at the last we accosted one that by his attire and behaviour seemed to be some great personage whom wee thought it not our parts to call in question, but very dutifully making our obaysance unto him, gave him the time of the night, for the which he not onely gave us thankes but also began to commend our diligence and care and good attendance, when before his face sate halfe of our company asleep, leaning their heads against their bils and their billes against the wall."

Innogen.—This lady is mentioned as the wife of Leonato in the first stage-direction in ed. 1600, but she does not appear in the play itself. It may be worth notice that the name was perhaps taken from that of the wife of Brute in legendary British history,—"Brute and his wife Innogen arrive in Leogitia," Holinshed, ed. 1586.

They are not the men you took them for.—It would appear from a notice of watchmen in Lupton's London and the Countrey Carbonadoed and Quartred into Severall Characters,

1632, that this was formerly a conventional phrase with those gentry,—"poore souldiers are now and then helpt to a lodging by their meanes; they'le visit an ale-house under colour of search, but their desire is to get beere of the company, and then, if they be but meane men, they master them; and they answere them, Come, pay, with this *usuall* phrase, *you are not the men wee looke for*, and demand of the hostesse if shee have no strangers in her house; having got their desire, they depart with this complement,—well, if our businesse were not extraordinary, we would have stay'd, but we must search other places upon suspition; it is, gentlemen, for the King,—and so depart with the amazement of the honest company and laughter to themselves."

They hope they serve God.—Although Dogberry's inimitable speech is of course the poet's own, it is just possible that he might have had in his recollection some popular anecdote of the time similar to one thus recorded in Jacke of Dover his Quest of Inquirie, 1604,—"There was of late in Nottingham a certaine justice of peace who one time, ryding through the streete, he met with a swaggering companion called Cutting Tom, who in a braverie tooke the wall

of M. Justice and almost tumbled both him and his horse downe into the dirt; whereupon in an anger he caused the ruffian to be staide, and asked him what he was? Mary, quoth Cutting Tom, I am a man as you are. But, quoth the justice, whom dost thou serve? Whom do I serve, quoth he, why, I do serve God. Serve God, sayd the justice, what, dost thou mocke mee? Goe, carry the knave to prison; Ile teach him some other answer then to say I serve God. To the jaile was he born, where for that night he lay, and on the morrow brought before him againe. Now, sirra, quoth the justice, are you better advised yet? Tell me who do you serve now? Why, quoth Cutting Tom, I serve God still. But, sayd the justice, dost thou serve nobody else? Yes, quoth he, I serve my Lord President of Yorke. Gods body, knave, why didst not say so at first? Mary, quoth he, because I had thought you had loved God better then my Lord President, for now I see for his sake I am set at liberty and not for Gods. Therefore Ile serve God no more, but stil my Lord President."

The stupidity of the constables in former days was so familiar a theme that no useful purpose would be answered by any extended

notice of contemporary accounts. The following letter, however, from Lord Burghley, dated 1586, addressed to Sir F. Walsingham, contains so graphic a description of their inefficiency, it may be quoted as an illustration. It was first printed by Mr. Collier, whose copy I have collated with the original in the State-Paper Office, —"Sir—As I cam from London homward, in my coche, I sawe at every townes end the nombre of x. or xij. standyng, with long staves, and untill I cam to Enfeld I thought no other of them, but that they had stayd for avoyding of the rayne, or to drynk at some alehouses, for so they did stand under pentyces at alehouses. But at Enfeld fyndyng a dosen in a plump, whan ther was no rayne, I bethought myself that they war apoynted as watchmen, for the apprehendyng of such as ar missying; and theruppon I called some of them to me apart, and asked them wherfor they stood ther? and on of them answered,—To tak 3 yong men. And demandyng how they shuld know the persons, on answered with these wordes:—Mary, my Lord, by intelligence of ther favor. What meane you by that?, quoth I. Marry, sayd they, on of the partyes hath a hooked nose.—And have you, quoth I, no other mark?—No, sayth

they. And then I asked who apoynted them; and they answered on Bankes, a Head Constable, whom I willed to be sent to me.—Suerly, sir, who so ever had the chardg from yow hath used the matter negligently; for these watchmen stand so oppenly in plumps, as no suspected person will come neare them; and if they be no better instructed but to fynd 3 persons by on of them havying a hooked nose, they may miss therof. And thus I thought good to advertise yow, that the Justyces that had the chardg, as I thynk, may use the matter more circumspectly."

Gifford has forcibly shown there is little probability in the supposition that the well-known allusion in Ben Jonson to the Watch "mistaking words" is aimed at the constables of Shakespeare, the practice of introducing them satirically into plays being very common, and by no means peculiar to the great dramatist. The inconvenience arising from the practice of making the lower sort of people constables and tithingmen is the subject of a letter, dated in 1605, copied in MS. Addit. 6178, art. 13. Compare also what Smith says in his Commonwealth of England, ed. 1601, p. 97,—"for so much as every little village hath commonly two constables, and many times artificers, labourers



and men of small abilitie bee chosen unto that office, who have no great experience nor knowledge nor authoritie, the constables at this present seeme rather to bee, as it were, the executors of the commaundement of the justices of peace."

A stool and a cushion for the sexton.—" Item, paid for hinges and nayls, and for mendinge the geaole, and a staple and a trapp doore and an officiall stoole, &c., 8.s. 4.d.," Municipal Manuscripts of Stratford-on-Avon, 1630.

An early Dutch play by Starter, entitled Timbre de Cardone, 1618, is founded on the same story as Much Ado about Nothing, but I can hardly agree with Mr. Gosse that its author " made large use of his reminiscences " of Shakespeare's comedy. The title-page, as Mr. Gosse observes, has an engraving of Gironde pointing out the supposed tomb of Fenicie to Timbre in the church. This engraving appears sufficiently curious to merit reproduction.

Charles the First, in his copy of the second folio preserved at Windsor Castle, writes against the title of Much Ado about Nothing, " Bennedik and Betrice," not perhaps meaning a new title, but merely that these were the leading and probably his favourite characters.

Some of the prominent phrases in Much Ado about Nothing were copied, and others imitated, by Heywood, in his Fayre Mayde of the Exchange, 1607, e.g.,—"I am not well, and yet I am not ill," similar to Beatrice's account of Claudio in act ii. sc. i.; "ye gods of love, that sit above," a song; "this is the sum of all," the same words being used by Don Pedro in the first act; "and yet, by this light, I am horribly in love with her," probably copied from the well-known passage in Benedick's speech in the second act; "tis most tolerable and not to be endured," as Dogberry also sagely remarks. This last phrase may be his perversion of a proverbial one. "Plays and players are not tollerable nor to be endured," as Northbrook observes in his Treatise on Playes, 1579. Capell, p. 119, mentions some imitations from Much Ado about Nothing in Blurt Master Constable, 1602; and there is a passage in Chapman's Monsieur d'Olive, 1606,—"O that I were a man for's sake," which appears to be quoted from Shakespeare's play. There is preserved in the Ashmolean Museum an early ballad entitled Much Ado about Nothing, but it has no connexion with the comedy.

Titus Andronicus.

THERE can be no doubt whatever but that in or before the year 1598, Shakespeare had written a tragedy on the subject of and entitled Titus Andronicus. This fact is established on the well-known and incontestable evidence of Meres in the Palladis Tamia, a work entered on the Stationers' Registers on September 7th, 1598, and published in that year. Those, therefore, who, like myself, cannot believe that any portion of the tragedy emanated from Shakespeare, have found it difficult to reconcile this opinion with the positive testimony of Meres and with the fact of its being included in the collective edition of 1623. In venturing to suggest what is, I believe, a novel solution of this difficulty, I would premise that I pay no attention to the extravagant pretensions to editorial accuracy set forth by the editors of the first folio. It is known that those editors misrepresented the facts in their statement respecting the copies they made use of, so that

the mere fact of their including a play in their collection is not a substantive evidence that it was written by Shakespeare. The carelessness displayed by them in the selection of those copies invalidates such an assumption; while the public of the day were indifferent in such matters, save in the exceptional case of the great popularity of a particular drama. It is true that the editors were no doubt aware that Shakespeare had written a tragedy of Titus Andronicus, but my belief is that, not being able to obtain a copy of it, they contented themselves with a late edition of another play on the same subject, published under this title,—"The Most Lamentable Tragedie of Titus Andronicus, as it hath svndry Times beene plaide by the Kings Maiesties Seruants. London, Printed for Eedward White, and are to be solde at his Shoppe, nere the little North Dore of Pauls, at the signe of the Gun. 1611," 4to. That Shakespeare's name is not on this title-page is a fact which is no evidence in the question of authorship, but the assertion that the tragedy had been played by the King's Company is in all probability untrue, for the next half-title in the same edition speaks of it as "the most lamentable Romaine Tragedie of Titus Andro-

nicus, as it was plaid by the Right Honorable the Earle of Darbie, Earle of Pembrooke, and Earle of Sussex their Seruants." It was in fact reprinted from an earlier edition which was issued in 1600 under the following title,—"The most lamentable Romaine Tragedie of Titus Andronicus. As it hath sundry times beene playde by the Right Honourable the Earle of Pembrooke, the Earle of Darbie, the Earle of Sussex, and the Lorde Chamberlaine theyr Seruants. At London, Printed by I. R. for Edward White, and are to bee solde at his shoppe, at the little North doore of Paules, at the signe of the Gun. 1600." 4to. There was an earlier edition in 1594, thus recorded in Langbaine's Account of the English Dramatick Poets, 1691, p. 464,—"Titus Andronicus his Lamentable Tragedy; this play was first printed 4° Lond. 1594, and acted by the Earls of Derby, Pembroke, and Essex, their servants." In all probability, *Essex* is here a misprint for *Sussex*, as in the title-pages above quoted. The edition of 1594 was thus entered on the books of the Stationers' Company on February 6th, 1593-4,—"John Danter, Entred for his copye under thandes of bothe the wardens a booke intituled a noble Roman historye of Tytus An-

dronicus." It is unquestionably the same play which Henslowe records as having been acted by the Earl of Sussex's company early in 1594, and by the Lord Admiral's and the Lord Chamberlain's men in June of the same year,—"Receiued at Titus and Ondronicous the 23 of Jenewary, iij.*li.* viij.*s.*—Receiued at Titus and Ondronicous the 28 of Jenewary, 1593, xxxx.*s.*—Receiued at Tittus and Ondronicus the 6 of Febery, 1593, xxxx.*s.*—5 of June, 1594, receiued at Andronicous, xij.*s.*—12 of June, 1594, receiued at Andronicous, vij.*s.*" The sums here named are Henslowe's shares of the proceeds of the representation. It is extremely unlikely that Shakespeare, who was always attached exclusively to the Lord Chamberlain's company, should have written a play in which that company could only have had a very small interest. The mere fact of this drama having been acted by the several private companies above referred to satisfies me that it does not belong to Shakespeare, but that it is to be classed with the old play of Lear and the others the subjects of which constituted the chief obligations of the great dramatist to previous writers. The internal evidence points irresistibly in the same direction, and I am convinced that Shake-

speare's play of Titus Andronicus has yet to be recovered.

The loss of Shakespeare's play on the subject may possibly be attributed to its having been a failure in comparison with his other productions. It was probably withdrawn from the stage soon after its first appearance, and the manuscript may have been lost before the editors of the folio of 1623 made their collection. Ben Jonson, writing in 1614, ignores Shakespeare's drama, and thus refers to the popularity of the older play,—"hee that will sweare Jeronimo or Andronicus are the best playes, yet shall passe unexcepted at heere as a man whose judgement shewes it is constant and hath stood still these five and twentie or thirty yeeres. Though it be an ignorance, it is a vertuous and stay'd ignorance; and next to truth, a confirmed errour does well; such a one the author knowes where to finde him," Induction to Bartholomew Fair, 1614. Jonson hardly means here to convey the idea of a precise date, but merely that it was about the same age as the old play of Jeronymo, which was written about the year 1588. It is again alluded to in Father Hubburd's Tales, 1604,—"Nevertheless, for all my lamentable action of one arm, like old Titus Andronicus,

I could purchase no more than one month's pay for a ten months' pain and peril, nor that neither, but to convey away my miserable clamours, that lay roaring against the arches of their ears, marry, their bountiful favours were extended thus far,—I had a passport to beg in all countries." It is also worth notice that a German translation of a play of Titus Andronicus occurs in the curious collection of English Comedies and Tragedies acted in Germany, and published in German in the year 1620. This play is supposed by Tieck to be a mutilated and abbreviated copy of a drama anterior to the published tragedy.

At the same time that Danter published the tragedy of Titus Andronicus, 1594, he issued a ballad on the same subject, which was often reprinted. An early copy of it, now before me, is entitled,—"The Lamentable and Tragicall History of Titus Andronicus, with the fall of his five and twenty sons in the wars of the Goaths, with the ravishment of his daughter Lavinia by the Empresse two sons through the means of a bloody Moor taken by the sword of Titus in the war, with his revenge upon them for their cruell and inhumane Act; to the tune of Fortune my Foe." This seems to be merely a ballad founded on the story of the play.

Edward Ravenscroft published an alteration of the following play in the year 1687, in the preface to which he says,—"I think it a greater theft to rob the dead of their praise then the living of their money: that I may not appear guilty of such a crime, 'tis necessary I should acquaint you that there is a play in Mr. Shakespears volume under the name of Titus Andronicus, from whence I drew part of this." He then adds,—"I have been told by some anciently conversant with the stage that it was not originally his, but brought by a private author to be acted, and he only gave some master touches to one or two of the principal parts or characters; this I am apt to believe, because 'tis the most incorrect and indigested piece in all his works; it seems rather a heap of rubbish then a structure." Langbaine, however, p. 465, gives part of a prologue to the tragedy, written by Ravenscroft, but afterwards suppressed, in which he distinctly speaks of this drama as wholly written by Shakespeare. The tradition above recorded can, therefore, hardly be safely relied upon.

It is worthy of remark that Thomas Pavier owned the copyright of a piece called Titus Andronicus, which was assigned by his widow

to two other publishers in 1626; but whether it was a tragedy or a prose history is not stated. From the terms of the entry, I should be inclined to imagine that it was the latter.

MEMORANDA.—A.D. 1879.

The preceding observations on Titus Andronicus were written by me in the year 1864, and although the theory therein advanced was somewhat a bold one, no reasons have since occurred to induce me to discard it as impossible. It is, indeed, the only hypothesis on which the evidences of Meres and the First Folio can be thoroughly reconciled with the absolute contrast of the printed tragedy to Shakespeare's dramatic tone and genius.

It is idle to say that there are in it a few lines and isolated passages which would not disgrace the pen of Shakespeare. The same might be said of many other contemporary dramas. And there is not a sufficient number of those lines and passages in themselves to countenance the idea of the drama being one amended by the great poet, and, moreover, they are not of that dramatic-positional character which would justify the idea of the whole being an alteration by Shakespeare even in the earliest part of his literary career. It is, of course, by no means impossible that the tragedy alluded

to by Meres was in itself an alteration of the old play, but it seems out of the question to believe that the copy we now have could have been that alteration.

The antagonism between the external and internal evidences is so perplexing, it is no matter for wonder that many theories have been suggested. Amongst these most critics will in the long run, I apprehend, reject as least deserving of credit that which would assign the tragedy in any way as a whole to Shakespeare. Gervinus implies that as his talent was equal to "affect the noisy style of a Kyd and a Marlowe," he might have done so in the present instance, but surely not without exhibiting some great trace of that refining dramatic power which was part of his intellectual nature.

Now as to the exact position of the Lord Chamberlain's Company in regard to this tragedy. I must have been too rash in insinuating (see p. 64) that the Company had even a very small interest in it. There is no proof of anything of the kind. It was first produced *as a new play* on January the 23rd, 1593-4, being acted by "the Earl of Sussex his men," and producing for Henslowe's share the then large sum of £3 8s. 0d. The Lord Chamberlain's

Company did not play at Newington until the following June, when Titus Andronicus had so declined in popularity that twelve shillings and seven shillings only are pocketed by Henslowe at the two recorded performances, and after that month it appears to have been withdrawn. The Chamberlain's Company is not mentioned in the only notices we have of the first edition of the tragedy which appeared in 1594, and it is important to observe that, although the name of that company appears with the others on the title-pages of the editions of 1600 and 1611, it is omitted in both in the first half-title. The probability is entirely against the Lord Chamberlain's Company having had more to do with the play than joining in the performance of it in June, 1594.

The publishing evidences point in the same direction. Neither Danter nor White had aught to do with any of the genuine productions of Shakespeare, while the entry of assignment from Millington to Pavier in 1602 may, as I have suggested, refer to a prose history, in the same way that the "book called Thomas of Reading," named in the same entry, certainly was. Pavier, as appears from other entries, owned the copyright of a ballad of Titus

Edm: Bregoster
Rob: Bwcle.

4° Augusti 1626

A Mytnid ouer vnto yͤm by mr̃ Parker
and Consent of ye full Court of
Assistants the Copies estate wᶜʰ late
and Entred to master Thomas Pavier
Edw Pavier and Cadman ye Copies
after mentioned viz. } Wm.

The Historye of Hen: the fift with the play of the Iuncs
Mr. Pavier right in Shakesperes plaies or any of them
Sr John old castle a play
Tytus & Andronicus
Historye of Hamlett

Andronicus, the title of which must not be confused with that of either the play or the history. The entry of assignment from Mrs. Pavier to Brewster and Bird in 1626 may certainly refer to the last, for "Tytus and Andronicus" is not included in the "right in Shakesperes plaies or any of them," but is inserted in company with the prose Hamlet. Whatever the book was, it was assigned by Bird to Richard Cotes in 1630. This Richard Cotes was a publisher who owned a large number of favourite prose histories, and it is probable that this one was an early edition of an excessively rare chap-book of the last century in my possession entitled, "The History of Titus Andronicus, the Renowned Roman General, who, after he had saved Rome by his Valour from being destroyed by the barbarous Goths and lost two-and-twenty of his valiant Sons in ten Years War, was, upon the Emperor's marrying the Queen of the Goths, put to disgrace and banish'd. Newly Translated from the Italian copy printed at Rome," 12mo. Northampton, n.d. At the end of this chap-book is inserted the old ballad on the subject previously alluded to.

A revolting story, which seems to have been

suggested by the pie incident in Titus Andronicus, is told in the Famous Historie of the Seven Champions of Christendome. I quote from the edition of 1608, but there was an earlier one in 1596 or 1597,—"these words pricked the negars to the gall and caused them to commit the wickedst deede that ever was practised under the celestiall globe of heaven. First, they sheathed their poniards in the breasts of all the marchants children, whose guiltlesse bloud stayned all the chamber with a crimson colour. Then with their fauchions did they cut their bodies all in sunder and caused seven pies to be made of their flesh, and after served in a banquet to their wofull parents whom the mercilesse Moores set at a square table, the marchant placed directly opposite against his wife, where they were constrayned eyther to feede upon their owne children or starve for want of other sustenance."

In an inventory of the theatrical costume at the Rose Theatre in March, 1598-9, mention is made of "the Mores lymes," which Malone suspects "were the limbs of Aaron the Moor in Titus Andronicus," who in the original play was probably tortured on the stage. An actor whose peculiar action with one arm was cele-

brated in the part of Titus is curiously alluded to in Father Hubburds Tales, 1604.

According to an author, whose name I have omitted to note, Shadwell intimates that Ravenscroft got up the story alluded to at p. 67 with a view to exalt his own merit in having altered the tragedy of Titus Andronicus. This testimony may be of some importance in estimating Ravenscroft's credibility, but there is an expression in his preface, which, as it now just occurs to me, tends greatly to the probability of there being some truth in his statement. He says that the tragedy was "brought by a *private* author to be acted," and this is exactly what we might believe, namely, that it was written by an amateur who had received a classical education. Little need be thought of the discrepancy between Ravenscroft's original Prologue and his account of the tradition, for he may not have heard of the latter until after the first production of his alteration.

As might be expected in the study of a drama so suspicious as to authenticity, the critics are greatly at variance in respect to the particular speeches to be assigned to the hand of the great dramatist. Coleridge would give the five speeches in act v. sc. 2 commencing,

" I am not mad," to his pen, but surely there are passages in the tragedy far more Shakespearean than these. On reading Titus Andronicus once more, I trust for the last time, the Clown's speeches appear to me to be as much in his manner as any others, and that in them, if with certainty anywhere, may be traced some of the few " master touches," if Ravenscroft's tradition is to be accepted; but I do not really believe that Shakespeare wrote a single word of it.

SHAKESPEARE'S NAME.

There are five and only five undisputed genuine signatures of the great dramatist known to exist, and in each instance he has written his surname without an *e* at the conclusion of the first syllable. To those who would shudder at the idea of the greatest author of the world not knowing how to spell his own name, or to those who are unacquainted with the state of the surname question in his time, the poet's own written authority would appear to be decisive. A little enquiry would, however, create a suspicion that such a conclusion may be illusory.

Orthography of every kind was in an unsettled state in the poet's time, and there was no fixed standard in the case of surnames, few persons then adhering to an uniform mode of spelling even in their own signatures. With respect to the Shakespeares, neither the parents of the dramatist nor their daughters could write at all, and the first members of the family competent to affix their signatures instead of a mark, an accomplishment for which they were indebted

to the Free School at Stratford-on-Avon, were the poet and his brothers. One autograph only of any of the latter has been discovered, and in that the important letter *e* distinctly appears; so that, if we adopted the system of guiding our early surname orthography by autographs, we must, when speaking of the poet, write *Shakspere*, but, when we have occasion to mention his brother, it must be *Shakespere*,— a manifest absurdity.

It thus being certain that there was no uniform orthography of the surname adopted by the Shakespeare family, we could only prefer the form of *Shakspere* on the suppositions not only that the poet invariably so wrote his name, but that it was his wish that the curtailed spelling should be that of his own, or of the family surname. With respect to the former surmise, there is practically merely the evidence afforded by three late signatures, for those attached to the Will, having been written at the same time, can only be taken, for the purposes of this argument, as one example. In regard to the other theory, it is clear that he had no fancy for the general adoption of the signature form, for otherwise it is incredible that his name should appear as Shakespeare in

the only two works that we can safely believe to have been printed under his own superintendence. That the latter was the form he desired that his name should take in literature there can be no reasonable doubt, and, as if to decide the question, to the only contribution he ever made to the work of another author the name there appears with a hyphen,—William Shake-speare. Moreover, the poet's two intimate friends and editors in 1623 uniformly give his name in its full proportions, although one of them in the same volume allows his own to appear in different forms.

In the original tracings from the Will made by Steevens in company with Malone in the year 1776, an *a* is clearly shown in the second syllable of that one of the signatures which has become somewhat indistinct since that period. This is the best evidence we can now have on the subject, and, if accepted, it would show that the form of the poet's signature was a matter of accident. For the secure discussion of the question I have assumed that all the signatures are uniformly spelt. The really important letter is the *e* not the *a*, for the pronunciation of the name practically depends upon the former. That the great dramatist was familiarly ad-

dressed at Stratford-on-Avon as Mr. Shaxper may be gathered from the orthography adopted by the scrivener who drew up the Will, but that he was known then amongst his own literary friends, and that he ought to be known now in literature, as Shakespeare is sufficiently established by the testimony of Ben Jonson and many others.

J. O. H.-P.

Hollingbury Copse,
Brighton,
28 October, 1879.

PLEASE DO NOT REMOVE
CARDS OR SLIPS FROM THIS POCKET

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO LIBRARY

PR
2976
H25

Halliwell-Phillipps, James Orchard

Memoranda on All's well that ends well

UTL AT DOWNSVIEW
D RANGE BAY SHLF POS ITEM C
39 14 14 13 09 015 7